

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/490,680	01/24/2000	Robert J. Monson	5360	7479
75	90 07/10/2002			
Carl L. Johnson			EXAMINER	
Jacobson and Jacobson			WUJCIAK, ALFRED J	
Suite 285				
One West Water Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
St. Paul, MN 55107-2080			3632	
		DATE MAILED: 07/10/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

0	
y	١

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/490,680	MONSON ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Alfred J Wujciak III	3632			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 J	<u>une 2002</u> .				
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Thi	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	•				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8-17</u> is/are pending in the application					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8-17</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 January 2000</u> is/are:					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disappro	oved by the Examiner.			
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.					
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).					
a) The translation of the foreign language pro	ovisional application has been red	ceived.			
Attachment(s)	, ,				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 3632

DETAILED ACTION

This is the first Office Action for the serial number 09/490,680, User Coupled Workspace Shock Isolation System, filed on January 24, 2000.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent # 5,277,584 to DeGroat et al.

DeGroat et al. discloses a shock-isolation system (S) including a unitary metal platform (12,23) with an operator station (21) thereon, a first mounting member (which is the parts of 23 supporting 25) and a shock mount 10,16,18,34,36,38-39,40-42 wherein the system is only supported by the shock mount (figure 2). See also Degroat et al. column 6, lines 24-29. The shock mount is located between a support structure (10) and the platform (12).

DeGroat also discloses that the platform includes a foot deck which is the area of platform located between the operator station (21) and first mounting member (figure 1). Furthermore, DeGroat et al. discloses that the platform includes an upright wall (which is the wall of 23 that extends upward from 12 and supports 54) having the first mounting member (figure 2). Finally, Degroat et al. discloses that the shock mount provides vibration damping,

Art Unit: 3632

isolates the operator station and platform from shock and vibration, and dampens vibration and shock.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeGroat et al. DeGroat et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed and as applied to the claims above. However, DeGroat et al. does not disclose that the unitary platform has a surface area of about 20 to 30 square feet. It is common knowledge in the prior art to have made a platform with a surface area of about 20 to 30 feet for the purpose of supporting various size objects thereon. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have made the De Groat et al. platform with a surface area about 20 to 30 feet in order to support a larger size operator station and other various sized structures.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/24/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's argument on page 3, stating that DeGroat does not disclose a shock isolation system. The examiner believes that DeGroat teaches the same function for absorbing and preventing the vibration/shock from an external impact. When the external impact

Art Unit: 3632

strikes the ground/floor, the vibration/shock will travel toward to the support structure and then to the shock mount. The function for shock mount is to prevent the vibration/shock from entering the platform to effect the operator.

The applicant's argues that the term of "shock" is different from the term of "vibration". According to Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary where it says "shock" is a disturbance in the equilibrium or permanence of something, while "vibration" says, a periodic motion of the particles of an elastic body or medium in alternately opposite directions from the position of equilibrium when that equilibrium has been disturbed. The examiner believes that "shock" and "vibration" teach same function.

The applicant disagreed that DeGroat does not teach the unitary platform is free to remain spatially fixed, thereby isolating the unitary platform from the effects of high "g" shocks to the supporting structure. The applicant believes that DeGroat et al. shows a rigid connection between the shock mount and the unitary platform, which cannot function as a shock mount. The examiner believes the specification (col. 6, lines 38-54) in DeGroat et al.'s patent # 5,277,584, explains that the shock mount and the platform are freely movement from each other. The spring and cylinder allow the platform to move in any direction above the shock mount and remain in connection with the shock mount. The examiner believes that DeGroat teaches the same function as the applicant's invention.

Art Unit: 3632

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred J Wujciak III whose telephone number is 703 306 5994. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Les Braun can be reached on 703 308 2156. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 308 3519 for regular communications and 703 308 3519 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 1113.

Joey Wujciak July 8, 2002 ANITA KING